

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

ORIGINAL  
RECEIVED

DEC 20 1996

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

CC Docket No. 93-129

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

In the Matter of )

800 Data Base Access Tariffs and the )  
800 Service Management System Tariff )

and )

Provision of 800 Services )

CC Docket No. 86-10

ERRATUM TO BELL ATLANTIC<sup>1</sup> PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION

On November 27, 1996, Bell Atlantic filed a petition for reconsideration in the above captioned proceeding. Bell Atlantic inadvertently filed this petition pursuant to Section 1.429 of the Commission's Rules. Section 1.106 of the Commission's Rules requires that the petition for reconsideration be served on all parties to the proceeding. Bell Atlantic notifies the Commission by this filing that it has served copies of its petition for reconsideration on parties to the proceeding today.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward D. Young, III  
Michael E. Glover  
Of Counsel

  
Edward Shakin

1320 North Court House Road  
Eighth Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201  
(703) 974-4864

Counsel for the  
Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies

December 20, 1996

<sup>1</sup> The Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies ("Bell Atlantic") are Bell Atlantic-Delaware, Inc.; Bell Atlantic-Maryland, Inc.; Bell Atlantic-New Jersey, Inc.; Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania, Inc.; Bell Atlantic-Virginia, Inc.; Bell Atlantic-Washington, D.C., Inc.; and Bell Atlantic-West Virginia, Inc.

049

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

COPY  
RECEIVED  
Nov 27 '86  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS  
COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

|                                      |   |                      |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| In the Matter of                     | ) |                      |
|                                      | ) |                      |
| 800 Data Base Access Tariffs and the | ) | CC Docket No. 93-129 |
|                                      | ) |                      |
| 800 Service Management System Tariff | ) |                      |
|                                      | ) |                      |
| and                                  | ) |                      |
|                                      | ) |                      |
| Provision of 800 Services            | ) | CC Docket 86-10      |

**BELL ATLANTIC<sup>1</sup> PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

The Commission should reconsider its decision to disallow certain exogenous costs included in Bell Atlantic's 800 Data Base tariff. Rather than evaluating the specific costs that Bell Atlantic incurred to add a regional data base to its network, the Commission based its disallowance on the costs incurred by *other* companies. Such a disallowance is inconsistent with the Commission's prior authorization of exogenous treatment. Moreover, by penalizing Bell Atlantic for its use of more advanced technology, the Commission violates its own policies as well as those in the 1996 Telecommunications Act. Consequently, the Commission should reconsider its decision, and permit Bell Atlantic to recover the specific costs it incurred to deploy its data base, as well as the costs it incurred for the links and ports used to provide 800 service.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Bell Atlantic telephone companies ("Bell Atlantic") are Bell Atlantic-Delaware, Inc.; Bell Atlantic-Maryland, Inc.; Bell Atlantic-New Jersey, Inc.; Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania, Inc.; Bell Atlantic-Virginia, Inc.; Bell Atlantic-Washington, D.C., Inc.; and Bell Atlantic-West Virginia, Inc.

## **I. The Commission Should Reconsider Its Disallowance of Regional Data Base Costs**

In calculating Bell Atlantic's exogenous costs for its regional data base, the Commission completely rejects any reliance on Bell Atlantic's *own* costs. Instead, the Commission bases its allowance on the average costs submitted for four *other* regional Bell operating companies.<sup>2</sup> This is inconsistent with the Commission's grant of exogenous treatment in 1993. Then, the Commission concluded that "it is appropriate to allow the LECs to treat as exogenous the reasonable costs *they* incurred specifically for the implementation and operation of the basic 800 data base service required by Commission orders."<sup>3</sup> Now, the Commission denies Bell Atlantic recovery of the costs it incurred, and instead limits recovery to the costs that other companies incurred.

The Commission justifies rejecting Bell Atlantic-specific cost data in two ways: "[b]ecause Bell Atlantic has both the highest total regional data base investment and has shown large increases in investment at successive stages of [the Commission's] investigation."<sup>4</sup> But neither of these rationales even address the legitimacy of the cost showing relied on by Bell Atlantic. Moreover, by disallowing the higher costs associated with the deployment of more advanced technology, the Commission wrongly penalizes Bell Atlantic for its technology choice.

The Commission's reliance on the difference between Bell Atlantic's costs and those of other carriers is misplaced. Bell Atlantic's cost filing is based on what it spent to deploy the

---

<sup>2</sup> ***800 Data Base Access Tariffs and the 800 Service Management System Tariff and Provision of 800 Services***, CC Docket Nos. 93-129, 86-10, Report and Order, ¶ 102 (rel. Oct. 28, 1996) ("Report and Order").

<sup>3</sup> ***Provision of Access for 800 Service***, 8 FCC Rcd 907, 911 (1993) (emphasis added).

<sup>4</sup> Report and Order at ¶ 101.

regional data base. In contrast to other carriers, Bell Atlantic's network includes a more advanced data base platform that relies on IBM RISC 6000 Intelligent Network ("IN") technology.<sup>5</sup> This technology reduces up keep problems and is more adaptable to the provision of future 800 data base services. In contrast, the technology used by other carriers is based on a DEC technology that has been discontinued by the manufacturer. As a result, comparison to the less advanced technologies in the networks of other companies is unreasonable. Moreover, limiting Bell Atlantic's recovery to other companies' costs penalizes Bell Atlantic for its deployment of more advanced technology. This is directly contrary to Commission policy and the Act's admonition that the Commission must use its regulatory controls to "encourage the deployment" of such "advanced telecommunications capability."<sup>6</sup>

The Commission is correct that Bell Atlantic's revised data base cost support showed higher costs than did its original cost filing. As the Commission recognized, Bell Atlantic's original filing was based on a proprietary cost model. Almost a year after the original filing, the Commission rejected use of this cost model, which relied on projections of future costs, and required Bell Atlantic to refile its cost data on a different basis.<sup>7</sup> Bell Atlantic complied and filed

---

<sup>5</sup> Unlike 500 service, which relies on Bell Atlantic's generic advanced intelligent network platform, 800 service uses its own platform. *See Bell Atlantic Tariff FCC No. 1*, Transmittal No. 725, Bell Atlantic Reply to Petitions at 3 (filed Jan. 9, 1995).

<sup>6</sup> Telecommunications Act of 1996, P.L. 104-104, Section 706(a).

<sup>7</sup> *See 800 Data Base Access Tariffs and the 800 Service Management System Tariff*, 9 FCC Rcd 715 (Com Car. Bur. 1994).

a completely new set of cost data based on what it actually spent to deploy its data base, just as the Commission directed.<sup>8</sup>

Nowhere in the Report and Order does the Commission undertake any critical evaluation of that new cost data.<sup>9</sup> Instead the Commission's rejects Bell Atlantic's submission merely because it shows costs to be higher than the original cost study results -- a study that the Commission had already concluded could not be used to evaluate Bell Atlantic's tariff. In fact, the revised results were quite reasonable. While the original cost filing was based on a cost projection model, the supplemental filing was a "top down" reflection of what Bell Atlantic actually spent.<sup>10</sup> Because the actual costs were higher than the model's projection, Bell Atlantic's revised costs showed an increase over the original filing.

Regardless, any criticism based on the increase in costs in the revised filing should be irrelevant because Bell Atlantic did not adjust its rates or exogenous costs to reflect the higher costs in the revision.<sup>11</sup> Because Bell Atlantic's rates were fully justified by *either* cost submission, the Commission had no basis to rely on the difference between the two submissions to reject all of Bell Atlantic's cost support. But even if that were not the case, it would still be

---

<sup>8</sup> ***800 Data Base Access Tariffs and the 800 Service Management System Tariff***, CC Docket 93-129, Supplement to Direct Case of Bell Atlantic, Alternative Cost Support (filed Mar. 15, 1994) ("Supplemental Direct Case").

<sup>9</sup> Ironically, the Commission does evaluate and reject Ameritech's revised cost submission, yet the Commission authorizes higher exogenous costs for Ameritech than for Bell Atlantic. *See* Report and Order, ¶¶ 90-91.

<sup>10</sup> ***See 800 Data Base Access Tariffs and the 800 Service Management System Tariff***, CC Docket 93-129, Response to Oppositions to Direct Case of Bell Atlantic, Appendix A at 6 (filed May 5, 1994) ("Response to Oppositions").

<sup>11</sup> *See* Supplemental Direct Case at 2.

illogical to rely on the difference between the two Bell Atlantic cost submissions as justification to impose costs that are lower than *either* submission.

Because the Commission's stated reasons for rejecting of Bell Atlantic's cost support do not justify such rejection, the Commission should reconsider its decision. Bell Atlantic is entitled to recover the reasonable costs it actually expends to provide 800 service, and those costs are reflected in the record.

## **II. The Commission Should Reconsider Its Disallowance of Port and Link Costs**

The Commission's decision to deny recovery of the costs incurred for certain links and ports used to provide 800 service suffers from the same flaw.

For example, the Commission denied recovery of the costs for the links between the local and regional transfer points.<sup>12</sup> According to the order, such links "provide many services" other than 800 service.<sup>13</sup> This is a factual mistake that simply does not square with the record. The Commission bases its conclusion on GTE's explanation of GTE's network.<sup>14</sup> The record is clear, however, that for Bell Atlantic, almost all of the usage of these links is associated with 800 service. In fact, approximately 95% of the traffic carried over these links are 800 queries.<sup>15</sup> The order, however, simply fails to take into account the actual usage of these links.

---

<sup>12</sup> Report and Order, ¶ 115.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at n. 215.

<sup>15</sup> *See* Supplemental Direct Case at 4; Supplemental Direct Case at Workpaper 1; Response to Oppositions at 2, n. 6. The Commission acknowledges the Bell Atlantic record on this point, but it never addresses that fact when it makes its disallowance. *Compare* Report and Order, ¶ 111 *with* Report and Order, ¶ 115.

Similarly, the Commission should reconsider its decision to deny recovery of the port costs associated with the links between Bell Atlantic's local and regional transfer points.<sup>16</sup> If the links almost exclusively carry 800 query traffic, the associated ports must have the same usage. But again, the order fails to take the actual usage of the ports into account.<sup>17</sup>

Finally, the Commission also erred in its decision to deny recovery of the port costs between the regional transfer point and the regional data base.<sup>18</sup> The Commission recognized that the costs of the associated link were "specifically incurred to provide 800 data base query service."<sup>19</sup> If the link between two ports exclusively carries such traffic, the ports must carry the same traffic. The Commission's failure to allow recovery of the port costs is inconsistent with its own factual conclusion.

### **Conclusion**

As set forth above, the Commission should reconsider its decision and allow Bell Atlantic to recover the costs it incurred for its regional data base, the link between the local and regional transfer points, and the ports on the regional transfer point and regional data base.

---

<sup>16</sup> Report and Order, ¶ 116.

<sup>17</sup> The order mistakenly cites Bell Atlantic's direct case to support its claim of multi-service usage of the ports. The cited filing addresses the local and regional transfer points generally. The record is clear, however, that the specific ports used for 800 service were used almost exclusively for that purpose.

<sup>18</sup> Report and Order, ¶ 110.

<sup>19</sup> Report and Order, ¶ 108.

Edward D. Young, III  
Michael E. Glover  
Of Counsel

Respectfully submitted,

  
Edward Shakin

1320 North Court House Road  
Eighth Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201  
(703) 974-4864


Attorney for the  
Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies

November 27, 1996



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 20th day of December, 1996 a copy of the foregoing "Erratum to Bell Atlantic Petition for Reconsideration" was sent by first class mail, postage prepaid, to the parties on the attached list.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tracey DeVaux

John Bartlett  
Robert Butler  
Wiley, Rein & Fielding  
1776 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004-2608  
Counsel for Aeronautical Radio, Inc.

Kevin DiLallo  
Levine, Blaszak, Block & Boothby  
Suite 500  
1300 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-1703  
Counsel for Ad Hoc Telecommunications Users  
Committee

Roy L. Morris  
Allnet Communications Services, Inc.  
Suite 500  
1990 M Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Randolph J. May  
Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan  
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004-1008  
Attorneys for Compuserve Inc.

David Gross  
Richard Whitt  
Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan  
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004-1008  
Counsel for First Financial Management  
Corporation

Mary J. Sisak  
Donald J. Elardo  
MCI Telecommunications Corp.  
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Joseph Markoski  
Kerry Murray  
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey  
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Attorneys for National Data Corporation

Jay C. Keithley  
Sprint Communications Company  
1850 M Street, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20036

Thomas E. Grace  
John T. Lenahan  
Ameritech  
Room 4H70  
2000 West Ameritech Center Drive  
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196

Paul Berman  
Ellen K. Snyder  
Covington & Burling  
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
PO Box 7566  
Washington, DC 20044  
Attorneys for Anchorage Telephone Utility

Stephen G. Kraskin  
Kraskin & Associates  
Suite 810  
2120 L Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037  
Attorney for Atlantic Telephone Membership  
Corporation

Thomas J. Moorman  
General Counsel  
Regulatory and Industry Affairs  
John Staurulakis Inc.  
6315 Seabrook Road  
Seabrook, MD 20706

Robert Sutherland  
Richard M. Sbaratta  
Helen A. Shockey  
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.  
4300 Southern Bell Center  
675 West Peachtree Street, NE  
Atlanta, GA 30375

Alfred Winchell Whittaker  
Stuart A.C. Drake  
Kirkland & Ellis  
Suite 1200  
655 15th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

Theresa L. Cabral  
James P. Tuthill  
Pacific Bell and Nevada Bell  
2600 Camino Ramon  
Room 2W806  
San Ramon, CA 94583

Timothy P. Leahy  
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company  
One Bell Center  
Room 3504  
St. Louis, MO 63101

Jeffrey Bork  
US West Communications Inc.  
1801 California Street  
Suite 5100  
Denver, CO 80202

Thomas E. Grace  
The Ameritech Operating Companies  
Location 4H94 - Legal Department  
2000 W. Ameritech Center Drive  
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025

Shirley A. Ransom  
BellSouth Telecommunications Inc.  
3535 Collonade Parkway  
South E9D1  
Birmingham, AL 35243

Jay C. Keithley  
Central Telephone Companies  
1850 M Street, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20036

William D. Baskett, III  
Thomas E. Taylor  
David S. Bence  
Frost & Jacobs  
2500 PNC Center  
201 East Fifth Street  
Cincinnati, OH 45202-4182  
Attorneys for Cincinnati Bell Telephone  
Company

Richard McKenna  
HQE03J36  
GTE Service Corporation  
PO Box 152092  
Irving, TX 75015-2092

Paula Wagner  
GVNW, Inc./Management  
2270 La Montana Way  
Colorado Springs, CO 80918

Benjamin H. Dickens  
Gerard J. Duffy  
Brian D. Robinson  
Blooston, Mordofsky  
2120 L Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037  
Attorneys for Lufkin-Conroe Telephone  
Exchange, Inc.

Robert A. Mazer  
Nixon, Hargrave, Devans & Doyle  
Suite 800  
One Thomas Circle, NW  
Washington, DC 20015  
Attorney for Lincoln Telephone & Telegraph  
Company

Rodney Thiemann  
Revenue Requirements Manager  
Great Plains Communications, Inc.  
1635 Front Street  
PO Box 500  
Blair, NE 68008-0500

Gail L. Polivy  
GTE Service Corporation  
1850 M Street, NW  
Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20036

Howard J. Symons  
Keith A. Barrett  
Mintz, Levin  
Suite 900  
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Attorneys for LaFourche Telephone Company

Diane Smith  
Vice President of Federal Government Affairs  
ALLTEL Service Corporation  
Suite 1000  
1710 Rhode Island Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Joanne Salvatore Bochis  
National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc.  
100 South Jefferson Road  
Whippany, NJ 07981

Edward R. Wholl  
William J. Balcerski  
NYNEX  
120 Bloomingdale Road  
White Plains, NY 10605

James L. Wurtz  
Pacific Bell and Nevada Bell  
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004

Michael J. Shortly, III  
Rochester Telephone Corporation  
180 South Clinton Avenue  
Rochester, NY 14646

George Petrutsas  
Paul J. Feldman  
Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth  
11th Floor  
1300 North 17th Street  
Rosslyn, VA 22209

Rochelle D. Jones  
Director-Regulatory  
SNET  
227 Church Street  
4th Floor  
New Haven, CT 06506

Robert M. Lynch  
Richard C. Hartgrove  
J. Paul Walters  
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company  
One Bell Center  
Room 3520  
St. Louis, MO 63101

Brian D. Thomas  
Assistant Vice President  
Pacific Telecom Inc.  
1726 M Street, NW  
Suite 801  
Washington, DC 20036-2477  
Counsel for Telephone Utilities Exchange  
Carrier Association

Jay C. Keithley  
United Telephone Companies  
1850 M Street, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20036

Jeffrey S. Bork  
Robert B. McKenna  
Laurie J. Bennett  
US West Communications, Inc.  
1020 19th Street, NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036

Mark C. Rosenblum  
Ava B. Kleinman  
Seth S. Gross  
295 North Maple Avenue  
Room 3245F3  
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920